



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,140	10/23/2003	Robert J. Torres	AUS920030650US1	9210

7590 01/22/2007
Robert V. Wilder, Attorney at Law
4235 Kingsburg Drive
Round Rock, TX 78681

EXAMINER

CARLETON, THUY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2196

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,140

Applicant(s)

TORRES ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Carleton

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/13/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to amendment filed 12/13/2005 to the original application filed 10/23/2003.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In this amendment, claims 1, 16, 17 and 18 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko (US 7,024,626) in view of Carroll (US 6,762,777).

As to claim 1, Ko teaches a method for facilitating input of information by a user into a form displayed on a display device, said form being arranged for receiving said input into one or more input fields of said form and notification objects that provide extended information and may be triggered by a user action of editing data in text fields (column 7, lines 11- 18) but fails to explicitly teach determining when a displayed cursor is positioned within a predetermined area relative to a first input field. However, Carroll teaches determining when a displayed cursor is positioned within a predetermined area relative to a first input field, because Carroll discloses

Art Unit: 2179

when hovered over by cursor 104, now displays popup window 130 with popup information region 132 above the regular textual content, in balloon fashion (figure 2; column 3, lines 6-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko as taught by Carroll in order to make the document user friendly by allowing it to use the cursor only to trigger the extended information;

Ko teaches accessing a data file containing a first extended information, said first extended information containing information related to said first input field (column 5, lines 10-16);

and displaying said first extended information in a first position on said display device (column 7, lines 8-10);

Ko does not teach enabling said user to **change** a location on said display device for said first position. However, Carroll further teaches enabling said user to **change** a location on said display device for said first position (column 1 lines 43-47; column 4, lines 1-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko by enabling said user to **change** a location on said display device for said first position as taught by Carroll in order to enable the user to freely change a location on the document to insert editable popup windows making the document flexible for the user.

As to claim 16, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. It is directed to a storage medium for presenting the method of claim 1. Carroll further teaches a storage medium including machine readable coded indicia (column 3, lines 44-45), said storage medium being selectively coupled to a reading device (column 3, line 46), said reading device being selectively coupled to processing circuitry within a computer system, said reading device being selectively operable to read said machine readable coded indicia and provide program signals representative thereof (column 3, lines 47-48).

Art Unit: 2179

As to claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. It is directed to a system for processing the method of claim 1, Ko further teaches a system bus (column 3, lines 43-44);
and a CPU device connected to said system bus (column 3, lines 36-38);
and a input device connected to said system bus, said input device being arranged to enable user input to said system (column 3, lines 44-47).

5. Claims 7-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll, and further in view of Garland (US 6,252,596).

As to claim 18, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. Ko and Carroll do not teach displaying said first extended information in a visually enhanced state relative to other content of said form.

However, Garland teaches displaying said first extended information in a visually enhanced state relative to other content of said form (column 4, lines 6-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll by displaying said first extended information in a visually enhanced state relative to other content of said form as taught by Garland in order to display the information in an enhanced state, emphasizing the information to stand out for the user in comparison to the rest of the form.

As to claim 7, Ko and Carroll do not teach enabling said user to select a color in which said first input field is displayed on said display device.

Art Unit: 2179

However, Garland teaches enabling said user to select a color in which said first input field is displayed on said display device (column 4, lines 23-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll by enabling said user to select a color in which said first input field is displayed on said display device as taught by Garland in order to change and select the attributes for the option of displaying color in the input fields. This would give the user the benefit of modifying the input fields and personalizing the display of the selected form.

As to claim 8, Ko and Carroll do not teach enhancing a display of said first input field relative to other text on said form when it is determined that said displayed cursor is positioned within a predetermined area relative to said first input field.

However, Garland teaches enhancing a display of said first input field relative to other text on said form when it is determined that said displayed cursor is positioned within a predetermined area relative to said first input field (column 10, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll by enhancing a display of said first input field relative to other text on said form when it is determined that said displayed cursor is positioned within a predetermined area relative to said first input field as taught by Garland in order to enhance the display of the input field by determining the location of the cursor would benefit the user to focus on the input field instead of focusing on the form in its entirety.

As to claim 9, Ko and Carroll do not teach enhancing comprises magnifying said first input field relative to other text on said form.

Art Unit: 2179

However, Garland further teaches enhancing comprises magnifying said first input field relative to other text on said form (figure 4B; column 7, lines 54-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll by enhancing comprises magnifying said first input field relative to other text on said form as taught by Garland in order to magnify the display of the input field would benefit the user to focus on the input field in an enlarged state instead of focusing on the form in its entirety.

As to claim 10, Garland further teaches enabling said user to select a magnification level of said first input field relative to said form (column 10, lines 3-13).

As to claim 11, Ko and Carrol do not teach enhancing comprises maintaining relative size of said first input field while diminishing appearance of other text on said form.

However, Garland further teaches enhancing comprises maintaining relative size of said first input field while diminishing appearance of other text on said form (column 6, lines 64-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll by enhancing comprises maintaining relative size of said first input field while diminishing appearance of other text on said form as taught by Garland in order for the text portions of the form to become smaller or less appearing to the user and maintaining current size of the input field would benefit the user to focus on the input field instead of focusing on the form in its entirety.

Art Unit: 2179

6. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll and Garland (US 6,252,596) and further in view of Card et al. (US 6,924,822), hereinafter "Card"

As to claim 19, the rejection of claim 9 and 18 are incorporated herein in full. Ko and Carroll and Garland do not teach first extended information is presented in a magnified state. However, Card teaches first extended information is presented in a magnified state (figure 15A; column 14, lines 20-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko and Carroll and Garland by first extended information is presented in a magnified state as taught Card in order to enhance the display of the input and information in an enlarged or magnified state would benefit the user to focus on the information and input field instead of focusing on the form in its entirety.

(Original) As to claim 20, the rejection of claims 8 and 18-19 are incorporated herein in full.

7. Claims 2- 6, 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of Carroll as applied to claim 1 above.

As to claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. However, Ko further teaches hiding said first extended information when said displayed cursor is within a predetermined area relative to said second input field (column 6, lines 33-35).

As to claim 3, Ko does not teach enabling said user to select a presentation style for said display of said first extended information. However, Carroll further teaches enabling said

Art Unit: 2179

user to select a presentation style for said display of said first extended information (column 4, lines 6-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ko as taught by Carroll in order to enable a user to select a presentation style for the display of information; Thereby enabling involves the use of a user profile giving the user the ability to define the characteristics they want on the display screen.

As to claim 4, Ko further teaches presentation style comprises presenting said first extended information on said display device overlapping said first input field (column 5, lines 51-56).

As to claim 5, Ko further teaches presentation style comprises presenting said first extended information on said display device above said first input field (column 5, lines 51-56).

As to claim 6, Ko further teaches presentation style comprises presenting said first extended information on said display device to one side of said first input field (column 5, lines 51-56).

As to claim 12, Ko further teaches first extended information comprises information describing a required format for input of information to said first input field (column 4, lines 51-54 and lines 59-61).

As to claim 13, Ko further teaches first extended information comprises information describing a definition related to said first input field (column 4, lines 51-54 and lines 59-61).

Art Unit: 2179

As to claim 14, Ko further teaches first extended information comprises information describing an allowable range of data related to said first input field (column 4, lines 51-54 and lines 59-61).

As to claim 15, Ko further teaches first extended information comprises a work aid function operable to aid said user in entering information to said first input field (column 1, lines 21-26).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejected ^{by} to claims 1-20 is maintained.

a. Applicant argues that Ko does not disclose or even suggest "*enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field*".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Ko's and Carroll's teaching "This is accomplished in part by employing freely movable popup delimiter tags, which can be positioned and re-positioned within a document to highlight the enclosed information and associate with that information a popup message, graphic or other information" and "For instance, while the attachment of the popup window and content to the highlighted region has been described as including inputting of text, other information such as graphical information, URL or other network links, sound or graphic files can also be appended to the popup window 130. It is similarly contemplated that the popup could be a dynamic display,

Art Unit: 2179

having a scripting agent that provides the resulting popup display based upon a variety of factors, including a user profile. The attachment of a popup window can also be adapted to operate on footnotes, headers and other special areas of electronic text 108. Moreover popup windows can be applied to areas of documents, which are not necessarily text, such as scanned-in drawings or other graphical areas. Yet further, while the invention has been described as associating a single popup window with a highlighted area, two or more popup windows could be associated with a given area, and popup windows can be nested (popups on popups) if desired" (column 1, lines 43-47; column 4, lines 1-20) meets "enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field" as broadly claimed by Applicant.

b. Applicant argues that Carroll does not does not disclose or even suggest "enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field".

In response, Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Ko and Carroll's teaching "enabling a user to select and/or move the location of the information message relative to an information input field" as addressed above.

c. Applicant argues that Garland does not disclose "the user-enabled movable extended information window".

Art Unit: 2179

In response, Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of Garland, Ko and Carroll's teaching "the user-enabled movable extended information window" as addressed above.

d. Applicant argues that the similarity of various pieces and parts of the references as noted on pages 2-10 of the above identified Office Action have been noted but it is believed that there is no suggestion or nexus among the references to even suggest any combination of those references or the total combination of elements.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ko, Garland and Carroll together to link all the elements for a finalized product.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2179

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Carleton whose telephone number is 571-270-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TC

Thuy Carleton


NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER